

Begin forwarded message:

(1:37 PM PST Friday: Let me add my response to learning, earlier this morning, that there were no teeth cutting off funding even after the last "deadline" in the Pelosi bill:

Fuck this, then. I suppose that means (at best) that they're against ending the war as of now (over six-nine months withdrawal period). (After four years!) If you're for the latter (like 45% of the public polled, within a year) then cutting funding is the right, only and constitutional way to do it. If you're not for that, then funding restrictions would only amount to managing the war from Congress (except for forbidding expansion into whole new countries, like Iran, or massive escalations of troops, which are not feasible without a draft), which makes even me uneasy. So the Lee et al way is the ONLY way to go, now. The real alternative being to sign on to the war as, effectively, a full partner of the one commander-in-chief, which is what the Pelosi bill does, for all its smoke. That has to be rejected, hopefully defeated.

From: Daniel Ellsberg >
Date: March 9, 2007 1
To: "Tim Carpenter" <ast.net>
Subject: Re: [Ufpj-legi] Jage...in theresolution...makesit illegal to proceed with the war..."

A fabulous message: the whole sequence. Thanks. Dan

On Mar 9, 2007, at 12:32 PM, Tim Carpenter wrote: